



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/506,407	02/17/2000	Masumi Senoo	10991381-1	7749

22879 7590 06/02/2008

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

EBRAHIMI DEHKORDY, SAEID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

06/02/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM  
mkraft@hp.com  
ipa.mail@hp.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* MASUMI SENOO,  
KAZUO AOYAMA and SHAHZAD H. BHATTI

---

Appeal 2007-3529  
Application 09/506,407<sup>1</sup>  
Technology Center 2600

---

Decided: May 29, 2008

---

Before KENNETH W. HAIRSTON, MAHSHID D. SAADAT,  
and MARC S. HOFF, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

HOFF, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF CASE

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from a Final Rejection of  
claims 1-20. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We reverse.

---

<sup>1</sup> Application filed February 17, 2000. The real party in interest is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, LP.



referred to as the “First Reply,” the Examiner’s Answer (mailed April 21, 2006), and the Reply Brief (filed June 21, 2006), hereinafter referred to as the “Second Reply,” for their respective details.

### ISSUE

The principal issue in the appeal before us is whether the Examiner erred in holding that Ta teaches creating a printer menu structure and installing a printer menu structure on a printer.

### FINDINGS OF FACT

The following Findings of Fact (FF) are shown by a preponderance of the evidence.

#### *The Invention*

1. According to Appellants, they have invented a configurable printer menu structure. The printer user is able to determine the structure of the printer menu, select the font (and language) used to display the menu structure, and design and/or identify icons associated with various menu elements. In a particular embodiment of the invention, a printer is configured by creating a printer menu structure and installing the printer menu structure on the printer. The printer menu structure is installed on an erasable storage device in the printer (Spec. 2).

2. Appellants define “printer menu structure” in the Specification:

A particular menu structure is typically contained in the printer. The menu structure provides the functions necessary to control or manage the operation of the printer. The user navigates the menu structure by pressing one or more buttons to select the

desired menu operation (such as resetting the printer, initiating a form feed operation, or selecting a particular font or template).

(Spec. 1).

### *Ta*

3. Ta teaches an apparatus and method for selecting printer setup menu options which override both menu selections embedded in a print file on a diskette by a computer and printer default menu settings (col. 1, ll. 5-8), “to form a final set of printing instructions to a printer for a print job” (col. 3, ll. 31-33).

4. Ta teaches that “[o]nce the PC setup menu selections are made, they may thereafter be automatically handed to, embedded in and/or coupled with the print job interface code” (col. 8, ll. 2-4).

### PRINCIPLES OF LAW

Anticipation is established when a single prior art reference discloses expressly or under the principles of inherency each and every limitation of the claimed invention. *Atlas Powder Co. v. IRECO, Inc.*, 190 F.3d 1342, 1347 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 1478-79 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

### ANALYSIS

Claims 1-20 are argued as a single group. We select claim 1 as representative of this group, pursuant to our authority under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii).

In the Examiner's view, Ta teaches creating a printer menu structure in that "the user is able to structure a print menu by selecting form [*sic*, from] the pc selection menu a set of desired or relevant option from the p set up menu" (Ans. 3, citing Ta Fig. 1, item 104 and col. 7, ll. 45-52). Ta is said to teach installing the printer menu structure on the computer, "where in the set up options structured or selected from the pc menu is put on the printer by inserting the diskette inside the printer" (Ans. 3, citing Ta Fig. 2, item 202 and col. 8, ll. 31-34). Last, the Examiner states that Ta teaches that the printer menu structure is installed on an erasable storage device in the printer (Ans. 3, the aforementioned diskette).

We begin by noting that Appellants' claim requires creating and installing a printer menu *structure*. Appellants provide a definition of "menu structure" at page 1 of the Specification:

A particular menu structure is typically contained in the printer. The menu structure provides the functions necessary to control or manage the operation of the printer. The user navigates the menu structure by pressing one or more buttons to select the desired menu operation (such as resetting the printer, initiating a form feed operation, or selecting a particular font or template).

(FF 2).

By contrast, Ta's invention is directed to "an apparatus for assembling printing option menu *selections* to form a final set of printing instructions to a printer for a print job" (FF 3). We fail to find any discussion whatsoever in Ta of creating or modifying the printer menu *structure*, which a user would use to navigate by pressing one or more buttons, nor of installing such a structure on a printer.

The Examiner argues that Ta teaches creating a printer menu structure (Ans. 3). The section of Ta cited by the Examiner describes Figure 1, which is a “block diagram of system 100 PC print menu selections” (col. 7, ll. 45-52). A user selects the “Print” command on a PC, and thereafter “*selects the desired and/or relevant options from the P set up menu*” (*id.*, emphasis added). The Examiner further asserts that Ta teaches “assembling printer option menu selections to form a final set of printing instructions to a printer for a print job” (Ans. 7; FF 3). We agree with Appellants, however, that there is nothing in this passage that even remotely suggests creating a printer menu structure, as the claim requires (Second Reply 4).

The Examiner argues that Ta teaches installing a printer menu structure on a printer (Ans. 3, citing Ta, col. 8, ll. 31-34). We agree with Appellants, however, who argue that this section of Ta discusses loading *selections* from a (preexisting) PC setup menu into the printer by inserting a diskette into the printer (Second Reply 5). We note that Ta teaches earlier in column 8 that “[o]nce the PC setup menu selections are made, they may thereafter be automatically handed to, embedded in and/or coupled with the print job interface code” (FF 4). We agree with Appellants that the cited passages in Ta do not teach or suggest installing a menu structure on a printer (Second Reply 5).

Because we do not agree with the Examiner that Ta teaches creating a printer menu structure, as the phrase is understood from Appellants’ Specification, nor installing a printer menu structure on a printer, we find that Ta does not teach every limitation of claim 1. We therefore find error in the Examiner’s rejection of claim 1, as well as claims 2-20, which recite “printer menu structure,” under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

We conclude that Appellants have shown that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-20. On the record before us, Claims 1-20 have not been shown to be unpatentable.

DECISION

The Examiner's rejection of claims 1-20 is reversed.

REVERSED

KIS

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P. O. BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400